

Roy F. Weston, inc. Suite 5700 700 5th Avenue Seattle, Washington 98104-5057 206-521-7600 • Fax 206-521-7601

MEMORANDUM

DATE:

3 December 1998

TO:

David Bennett, WAM, U.S. EPA, Region X

FROM:

Michelle Turner, Chemist, WESTON, Seattle

Roger McGinnis, Senior Environmental Chemist, WESTON, Seattle

SUBJECT:

Validation of Chlorinated Pesticide Data

Laboratory Batch: K9805685

Site. Duwamish River

WORK ASSIGNMENT NO: 46-23-0JZZ

WORK ORDER NO.:

4000-019-038-5200-00

DOC. CONTROL NO.:

4000-019-038-AAAK

cc:

Bruce Woods, RAP-WAM, US EPA, Region X

Dena Hughes, Site Manager, WESTON, Seattle (memo only)

Kevin Mundell-Jackson, Database Management, WESTON, Seattle

The quality assurance review of one sediment sample, laboratory batch K9805617, collected from the Duwamish River has been completed. The sample was analyzed for chlorinated pesticides by Columbia Analytical Services of Kelso, Washington using EPA Method 8081. The sample was numbered:

98344078

Data Qualifications

The following comments refer to the laboratory performance in meeting the quality control criteria described in the technical specifications of the laboratory subcontract. The review follows the format described in the *National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review* (EPA OSWER Directive 9240 1-05, February 1994).

This document was prepared by Roy F Weston, Inc expressly for the EPA. It shall not be disclosed in whole or in part without the express, written permission of the EPA.



QA Review Batch K9805685 (Chlorinated Pesticides)

Site: Duwamish River

Page 2

1 Timeliness

All samples met holding time criteria of 14 days for sample extraction and 40 additional days for extract analysis.

GC/ECD Instrument Performance

i) Retention Time Windows

Retention times of all pesticides were within windows calculated from the initial calibration.

ii) DDT/Endrin Breakdown

The percent breakdown for 4,4'-DDT and Endrin was less than 20 percent for each compound and combined breakdown was less than 30 percent on both GC columns.

3 Initial Calibration

a) Individual Standard Mixtures

Retention time windows were calculated correctly.

Appropriate standards concentrations were used and peak heights of 50 to 100 percent of full scale were obtained.

Calibration factor percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) met QC criteria of 20 percent for pesticides and 30 percent for surrogates.

4 Calibration Verification

Instrument blanks and PEM samples were analyzed at the proper frequency

The difference between actual and calculated concentrations of individual pesticides was within QC criteria of ± 25 percent.

This document was prepared by Roy F Weston, Inc expressly for the EPA It shall not be disclosed in whole or in part without the express, written permission of the EPA



QA Review Batch K9805685 (Chlorinated Pesticides) Site Duwamish River Page 3

5. Detection Limits

Instrument detection limits met project required quantitation limits with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	QL Goal (µg/Kg)	Reported QL (µg/Kg)	
98344078	DDE	1	3	
98344078	Toxaphene	10	160	

Where quantitation limit goals were exceeded, undetected analytes were qualified (UI) to indicate matrix interference.

6 Blanks

a) Laboratory Method Blanks

Laboratory method blank frequency criteria were met.

No target analytes were reported in laboratory method blanks.

b) Field Blanks

No field blanks were associated with this laboratory batch.

7. System Monitoring Compounds (Surrogates)

Surrogate compound percent recovery met quality control criteria (P-project, L-laboratory) for all samples except.

Sample	Compound	Percent Recovery	QC Limits
K980827-MB	Tetrachloro-m-xylene	27	30-150 (P) 20-107 (L)

This document was prepared by Roy F Weston, Inc expressly for the EPA. It shall not be disclosed in whole or in part without the express, written permission of the EPA



QA Review Batch K9805685 (Chlorinated Pesticides)

Site: Duwamish River

Page 4

Surrogate recoveries for all associated samples were within both project and laboratory QC limits Decachlorobiphenyl in the method blank was within QC limits. No qualifiers were based solely on the method blank surrogate recovery.

8. Matrix Spike and Matrix Spike Duplicate

All matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) percent recoveries met QC guidelines. All relative percent differences between the MS and MSD recoveries were within QC guidelines

9. Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)

All LCS percent recoveries met quality control criteria

10 Field Duplicate Analysis

No field duplicate samples were associated with this sample delivery group.

11 Second Column Confirmation

The relative percent difference (RPD) in reported analyte concentration was greater than 35 percent for the primary and confirmation column for the following samples:

Sample Number	Compound	DB-5 Conc	DB-1701 Conc	RPD
98344078	beta-BHC	10	0.2 (ND)	192
98344078	DDT	0 5 (ND)	4	156

Differences can arise from analytical interferences on one column However, the relative percent differences are not deemed significant at the reported concentrations. The lower concentration was reported for each analyte

12. Sample Analysis

A cursory review of raw data was performed. All laboratory deliverables were present and complete. A duplicate analysis of Batch QC sample K9805793-007 was analyzed; all RPDs were less than 35 percent. No unusual problems were noted.

This document was prepared by Roy F Weston, Inc expressly for the EPA. It shall not be disclosed in whole or in part without the express, written permission of the EPA.



QA Review Batch K9805685 (Chlorinated Pesticides)

Site: Duwamish River

Page 5

13. Laboratory Contact

No laboratory contact was required.

Data Assessment

Upon consideration of the data qualifications noted above, the data are ACCEPTABLE for use except where flagged with data qualifiers that modify the usefulness of the individual values.

Data Qualifiers

- U The compound was analyzed for, but was not detected
- UJ The compound was analyzed for, but was not detected. The associated quantitation limit is an estimate because quality control criteria were not met.
- The analyte was positively identified, but the associated numerical value is an estimated quantity because quality control criteria were not met or because concentrations reported are less then CRDL or lowest calibration standard.
- R Quality control indicates that data are unusable (compound may or may not be present).
 Resampling and reanalysis are necessary for verification.
- N Presumptive evidence of presence of material (tentative identification).
- I Elevated reporting limit due to matrix interference.

COLUMBIA ANALYTICAL SERVICES, INC.

Analytical Report

Client:

Roy F Weston, Inc

Project:

Duwamish River/4000-027-001-2019-38

Sample Matrix:

Sediment

Service Request: K9805685

Date Collected: 8/20/98 Date Received: 8/21/98

Organochlorine Pesticides

Sample Name

98344078

Lab Code **Test Notes** K9805685-007

Units ug/Kg (ppb)

Basis Dry

Analyte	Prep Method	Analysis Method	MRL	Dilution Factor	Date Extracted	Date Analyzed	Result	Result Notes
alpha-BHC	EPA 3550A	8081A	1	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
beta-BHC	EPA 3550A	8081A	1	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
gamma-BHC (Lindane)	EPA 3550A	8081A	1	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
Heptachlor	EPA 3550A	8081A	1	I	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
Aldrın	EPA 3550A	8081A	1	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
Heptachlor Epoxide	EPA 3550A	8081A	1	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
gamma-Chlordane	EPA 3550A	8081A	1	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
Endosulfan I	EPA 3550A	8081A	l	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
alpha-Chlordane	EPA 3550A	8081A	1	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
Dieldrin	EPA 3550A	8081A	2	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
4,4'-DDE	EPA 3550A	8081A	3	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND 3UC	[B
Endrin	EPA 3550A	8081A	2	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	,
Endosulfan II	EPA 3550A	8081A	2	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
4,4'-DDD	EPA 3550A	8081A	2	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
Endrın Aldehyde	EPA 3550A	8081A	2	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
Endosulfan Sulfate	EPA 3550A	8081A	2	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
4,4'-DDT	EPA 3550A	8081A	2	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
Endrin Ketone	EPA 3550A	8081A	2	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND	
Methoxychlor	EPA 3550A	8081A	1	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	2	
Toxaphene	EPA 3550A	8081A	160	1	8/27/98	9/4/98	ND 1606	LI B

В

The MRL is elevated because of matrix interferences

Approved By

IS22/020597p

Date 9-15-98

00022

05685SVG AY2 - 7 9/15/98